RESPONSE TO COMMENTS REGARDING FINAL SITE INSPECTION REPORT FOR TEN
MUNITIONS RESPONSE RANGES NSWC INDIAN HEAD MD
9/27/10
TETRA TECH NUS

Tt TETRA TECH

PITT-09-10-067

September 27, 2010

Project Number 112G00810

Commanding Officer
Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Washington
1314 Harwood Street S.E.
Washington Navy Yard, D.C. 20374
Attention: Mr. Joseph Rail, P.E. (OBP1E)

Reference: CLEAN Contract No. N62467-04-D-0055
               Contract Task Order No. 0423

Subject: Final Site Inspection Report for Munitions Response Program Site Inspections at
               Ten Munitions Response Ranges, Naval Support Facility, Indian Head, Stump
               Neck Annex, Indian Head, Maryland

Dear Mr. Rail:

Enclosed are two (2) copies of the subject report. The Response to Navy and Regulatory Agency
comments on the draft final version are also attached.

If you have any questions regarding this document or need additional copies, please contact me
at 412-921-8308 or email: Ralph.Basinski@tetratech.com or Ellen Berklite at 412-921-8724 or
email: Ellen.Berklite@tetratech.com.

Sincerely,

Ralph R. Basinski
Project Manager

RRB/mlg
Enclosures

cc: Mr. Curtis Detore, Federal/NPL Superfund (letter/attachment/enclosure)
     Mr. Dennis Orenshaw, U.S. EPA (letter/attachment/enclosure)
     Mr. Nicholas Carros, NSF Indian Head (letter/attachment/enclosure)
     Ms. Bonnie Capito, NAVFAC Atlantic (letter via e-mail attachment)
     Mr. Nathan DeLong, NAVFAC Washington (letter/attachment/enclosure)
     Mr. John Trepanowski, P.E., Tetra Tech, Inc. (letter)
     Mr. Scott Nesbit, Tetra Tech, Inc. (letter)
     Ms. Ellen Berklite, Tetra Tech, Inc. (letter/attachment/enclosure)
     Project File – CTO 0423 (letter/attachment/enclosure)

Comment No.	PAGE	PARAGRAPH	SENTENCE	COMMENT	RESPONSE
1		General comment		We may need to discuss whether or not to include initial munitions hazard screening results in the SI. The hazard screenings would be a number between 1-4. It was included in the scope of work, but may be more appropriate for the RI/FS phase. If that's the case, then we should at least re-evaluate the current prioritization protocol rankings. The team can decide how we want to accomplish this (either within the SI or separately.)	This will be submitted in a separate document.
2		General comment		UXO 22 (Test Area 2) was not included in the SI because it's proceeding to NFA. We will need to complete a brief Decision Document or Closeout Document to be signed by Navy and EPA with MDE concurrence.	This will be submitted in a separate document.
3	2-1	First, section 2.1.2	5th	I believe the IED School was moved to Florida in the 1990s. Check this sentence for accuracy and to be consistent with what's stated later in the document.	This has been confirmed and the change has been made.
4	3A-7	First, section 3A.2.6.4	4th	Insert "used" after "Base."	This has been addressed.
5	5-10	First, section 5.14.5	1st	Change "detected" to "detect."	This has been addressed.
6	5-25	3rd	1st	Delete "for" after "food chain modeling."	This has been addressed.
7	5-27	First, section 5.26	2nd	At the end of the sentence, change "as" to "at."	This has been addressed.
8	5-29	Second bullet	4th	Delete "for" after "exceeded."	This has been addressed.
9	5-29	Third bullet	1st	Insert "in" after "exist for MC both…"	This has been addressed.
10	5-29	Last paragraph on page	4th	Change "than" to "that."	This has been addressed.
11	6-18	First, section 6.24.1	3rd	Delete "for" after "screening levels."	This has been addressed.
12	6-18	Fourth, section 6.24.1	1st	It's stated that two explosives were retained as COPCs. Shouldn't it be one explosive? The same comment applies to the first sentence on page 6-19.	One explosive - This has been addressed.
13	6-20	Last paragraph on page	1st	Delete "for" after "food chain modeling."	This has been addressed.
14	6-21	First, section 6.24.3	1st	This paragraph discusses two explosives as COPCs.	One explosive - This has been addressed.

				Shouldn't it be one?	
15	7-19	First, section 7.23	3rd	Revise "Table x-x" with the appropriate table #.	This has been addressed.
16	7-19	Second, section 7.23	3rd	Check the sentence for a typo. Should the HI for industrial be "0.2?"	HI=0.2 -- This has been addressed
17	7-20	First paragraph on page	2nd	Typo at end of sentence. "-5" should be "UXO 5."	This has been addressed.
18	7-20	First, section 7.24.1	3rd	Delete "for" after "screening levels."	This has been addressed.
19	7-23	First, section 7.26	3rd	At the end of the sentence, change "as" to "at."	This sentence has been removed to address an agency comment.
20	8-6	Second, section 8.13.4	7th	Check sentence for typo. Should "al-" be "all?"	All is correct and this has been addressed.
21	8-16	Fourth bullet	-	Check for wording errors. The bullet is confusing and difficult to understand as written.	This sentence has been adjusted to not be confusing.
22	9-11	Fourth, section 9.19.1	1st	Check for typos. "PA)" should be "PAL."	This has been addressed
23	10-7	First, section 10.15.2	1st & 2nd	What is this paragraph trying to say? It almost sounds contradictory or questions the validity of the survey. Consider revising or adding something like "despite snow being on the ground, best efforts were made to complete a visual survey and consequently no MEC/MD were located."	A limited visual survey was completed due to snow cover from the February 4, 2010 snow storm. A complete visual survey wil be completed during the RI.
24	10-11	First, section 10.23	5th	At the end of the sentence, change "as" to "at."	This sentence has been removed to address an agency comment.
25	10-12	First, section 10.25	1st	Not sure I agree with NFA for this site. If MEC and munitions debris (MD) are present, additional investigation or cleanup would be necessary. Shouldn't this advance to an RI for MEC?	This site will proceed to an RI with clearance of munitions debris in the area surrounding the "bowl," a subsurface geophysical survey, and and investigation of representative subset of subsurface anomaly discovered during the geophysical investigation.
26	11-13	First, section 11.23	2nd	At the end of the sentence, change "as" to "at."	This sentence has been removed to address an agency comment.
27	12-2	Section 12.4	Last sentence	Change "area" to "areas."	This has been addresseed.
28	12-12	First, section 12.18	Last sentence	Check the last sentence for errors. It's very confusing as written.	This sentence has been edited to be less confusing.
29	-	Figure ES-3	-	The Old Demolition Range (the most southern site) is shown on the map, but not labeled.	This site is not identified. Only ranges being inspected during the SI are labeled.
30	-	Section 2.2.3	Whole Section	It's a giant paragraph. Is there any way we can break it up a bit?	This comment has been addressed.
31	4-14	Section 4.25	MC Section	There are some missing	This comment has been

				words in this section	addressed.
32	5-29	Section 5.28	Next to last bullet	Didn't the background study of the base include groundwater?	The background study did not include groundwater.
33	6-24	Section 6.29	1st paragraph	The initial paragraph recommends further investigation for groundwater, but then recommends NFA for MC. Wouldn't a groundwater investiagtion fall under MC?	Yes, this comment has been addressed.
34	-	General Comment	-	The comment, "Leaching from soil to groundwater has been eliminated as a pathway, since groundwater is not used at the site." This Agency's policy is to restore groundwater to beneficial use whenever practicable. A lack of surface contamination which would indicate that there is little or no potential to leach to groundwater is an acceptable rationale for not sampling. An incomplete pathway is not.	This sentence has been removed in each section that it was written in.